DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 698 TE 500 145

Workshop Reports of the Annual Conference [On College Composition and Communication] (Denver, March 24-26, 1966).

National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
Pub Date Oct 66
Note-26p.
Journal Cit-College Composition and Communication; v17 n3 p175-200 Oct 1966
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors-Administrative Problems, Advanced Placement, College Freshmen, *Composition (Literary), Composition Skills (Literary), *Course Objectives, Course Organization, Curriculum Enrichment, English, English (Second Language), *English Instruction, English Programs, *Higher Education, Literature, Student Needs, Teacher Education, *Teacher Workshops, Teaching Machines, Writing

Workshop reports of 35 committees meeting at the Conference on College Composition and Communication are included. Nine reports discuss types of composition courses or programs which emphasize either rhetoric, literature, language, or communication. Five reports discuss the needs of and programs established for special students--superior, culturally disadvantaged, and adult students, as well as students needing remedial help. Other reports examine (1) advanced composition for prospective college, secondary, and elementary teachers, (2) types of papers assigned in composition courses, (3) teaching machines, (4) teaching composition to large numbers, (5) advanced placement programs, (6) areas and problems in administering freshman programs, (7) linguistics and the teaching of composition, (8) English teacher preparation, (9) maintaining proficiency in writing after the freshman course, and (10) teaching English as a second language. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

Volume XVII October, 1966 No. 3

TE 500 145 ED023698

Workshop Reports

ANNUAL MEETING
Denver, Colorado
March 24-26, 1966

All workshop reports submitted by their recorders have been printed, some slightly edited. As the numbers will indicate, very few reports are missing.

1A. RHETORIC: UNIVERSITIES

The first session began with an attempt to define "rhetoric." After some discussion, Professor Steinmann offered this definition: rhetoric is a choice between two or more relatively effective synonyms; it therefore includes style and syntax but excludes the classical "invention" mentioned by Professor McCrimmon at the Panel meeting. Although Mr. Steinmann's definition was challenged by those who said that there are no real synonyms, it was satisfactory to most participants. The following questions were discussed, with disagreement resulting in each case: whether freshman composition should be considered a service course; whether there is currently a trend to eliminate freshman composition altogether; whether we are attempting to teach too much in freshman composition; and whether the freshman rhetoric course should aim primarily to improve the student's thinking. Finally, however, the group agreed that the major obstacle in the freshman composition course is student resistance to the material and that a major aim of the course is therefore to create in the student a desire to express himself well.

Professor Stone began the second session with the question: are the aims of the freshman course which emphasizes rhetoric the same at universities with superior students and those with mediocre ones? Workshop participants agreed that the aims are the same but that methodology or pedagogy differs, since the student's writing is the subject matter of the course. Mr. Steinmann pointed out that the new rhetoric will be a body of knowledge about the teaching of writing and that it will thus serve as a focus for two types of rhetorical research, compositional and pedagogical. As this session drew to a close, workshop members arrived at two consensuses concerning the aims of the freshman course: (1) we should teach students to write clearly and accurately, and (2) the subject matter of the course is the student's own writing.

The third meeting was concerned with the qualifications of the instructor teaching a freshman composition course with emphasis on rhetoric. Professor McLeod suggested that we add to Professor Bailey's list the qualification that freshman composition teachers should be able to write well. During this session, workshop members reached agreement on the following recommendations: (1) that potential teachers of freshman composition courses emphasizing rhetoric should have had some course work in formal rhetoric (i.e., the history and theory of rhetoric); (2) that an undergraduate course in rhetoric be required of all English majors; and (3) that a future meeting of the CCCC include a closed workshop concerned with the content of such a course.

Chairman: Robert K. Stone, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee
Co-Chairman: Frederick McLeod, University of Missouri in Kansas City
Recorder: Cooper R. Mackin, Louisiana State University in New Orleans
Co-Recorder: William F. Belcher, North Texas State University
Consultant: Martin Steinmann, Jr., University of Minnesota

1B. RHETORIC: COLLEGES

After preliminary comments on the bibliography of basic books on rhetoric distributed to the workshop, the question of how rhetoric might be defined was promptly raised and became the basis for most of the discussion which followed. The first attempts at definition stressed the treatment of the forms of discourse or the patterns in which the mind seems to move in expressing its thoughts effectively. A reaction to such definitions as too narrow showed general accord with Professor McCrimmon's emphasis upon pre-writing. Comments came on the need to impart "an awareness of the inner life," which is to emerge in expression; the need to deal with "the problem of honesty," to remove the "barriers of reticence imposed by a brain-washed, cliché-ridden society;" and the need to encourage the student's development of a personal voice. The chairman concurred that rhetoric should be concerned with alerting the student to the possibilities for expression within himself and to the demands of his occasion and audience.

As discussion returned to the problem of broad definition, it was suggested that rhetoric includes all patterns of bringing ideas into expression. The group considered Aristotle's definition: the use of all available means of persuasion. It was noted that persuasion includes exposition because it broadly means getting the reader to see. Professor Sullivan, observing that rhetoric is more difficult to define than to describe, offered the Aristotelian description of it as "that body of knowledge, divisible into discovery, disposition (or organization), and style." In the chairman's opinion, the group's difficulty in defining the term arose from the composition teacher's "exposure to debased, partial rhetorics." As a description he offered, "Rhetoric has to do with the strategies of prose discourse, strategies applicable to all possible subjects."

Early in the second session, the workshop agreed on the following definition, presented by Professor Sullivan, as broad enough to fit everyone's practice, as containing the main parts of rhetoric, and as allowing the best principles to be derived from both traditional rhetoric and new approaches, such as field theory and generative rhetoric: "Rhetoric is the art of discovering and choosing from the available means of developing subject matter, organizing the results, and expressing them so that the whole composition will effect the writer's purpose in his chosen audience." The group was also able to find the aims of the rhetoric-centered course in this definition.

There was no clear accord on what the subject matter of student themes should be in a rhetoric-centered course, but certain pitfalls were mentioned: the linguistic approach (though it was agreed that linguistics is essential knowledge for the teacher), the non-rhetoric centered reader, repetition of the substance of high-school English, and appropriation of everything in the college curriculum. Reading, all agreed, is an important activity in a rhetoric course, since it provides sources of ideas and models of good writing. Discussion of appropriate textbooks revealed individual preferences for several rhetoric texts and rhetorically organized readers, but it was agreed that a formal rhetoric text is not indispensable to the teacher who has grounded himself in rhetoric.

Consideration of the selection and training of instructors for composition courses revealed the group's feeling that most candidates now available have insufficient training in rhetoric, and that until this deficiency is met in the future by the establishment of more upper level courses in the discipline in the colleges and universities, it would be wise for the departments in which new instructors teach to provide facilities for the development of their knowledge of rhetoric.

Chairman: John A. Rycenga, Sacred Heart University
Co-Chairman: Marguerite Smith Holton, Arlington State College of the University of Texas
Recorder: William A. Neville, State University College at Fredonia, New York
Co-Recorder: Robert L. Walker, O. P., Providence College
Consultant: John Sullivan, Boston College

1C. RHETORIC: COLLEGES OFFERING SPECIALIZED AND TWO-YEAR PROGRAMS

Throughout all the discussion concerning freshman composition, there was an awareness of the problems caused by the ever

changing character of the student body and of the ever changing needs of the community the junior college serves. With more terminal than transfer students, with more in need of remedial training the aims and content of the composition course in the two year college are subject to constant change. (Professor Wilkins' records at Metropolitan Junior College show 23% needing remedial work in 1960 and 63% in 1965.)

For such pupils the area of invention is most important. They do have experiences and knowledge; the difficulty lies in drawing these forth. A controlled situation for pre-writing was therefore advised, with discussion of the subject matter to stimulate their thinking. The research paper, while still used, is now more controlled. Such papers are shorter. The use of casebooks as source material was discussed. Literary ones proved less successful than the factual ones, but writing about a topic in the field of the student's interest produced better papers. Professor Christensen's material upon the multi-level sentence and upon the organization of the paragraph was reported to be helpful in teaching the structure of these units.

The group recognized the value of literature in the composition course as it gives a wider range of experience, provides an example of structure, style, and the use of rhetorical devices. Language study is also needed, but this should not exclude rhetoric. The over-emphasis upon grammar may be the result of insufficient training of teachers. Inservice training or workshops in the field of linguistics and rhetoric are therefore recommended.

Opinions differed about the value of secondary school experience, but all agreed that the two-year college teacher must appreciate the character of the course, have broad interests, be able to direct the discussions of the pre-writing period. Specific interests in rhetoric, language, or literature must be subordinated to the major aim, their use in composition. The inexperienced teacher may benefit from supervision by a more experienced instructor or by working with him in team teaching.

The group also felt more effort should be made to secure a lighter work load for the composition teacher. One member of W1C had 260 students.

Chairman: Joseph Keogh, Jamestown Community College
Co-Chairman: Arthur N. Wilkins, Metropolitan Junior College
Recorder: Katherine M. Allison, Everett Junior College
Co-Recorder: Esther M. Hamon, The Hiram Scott College
Consultant: James M. McCrimmon, Boston, Massachusetts

2A. LITERATURE: UNIVERSITIES

Coming directly to its first session from the panel "With Emphasis on Literature," the workshop maintained considerable interest in such terms as *intuition*, *discovery*, and *emotional response*. Though not always tied to composition, discussion of these terms recurred throughout the four sessions of the workshop.

The chairman introduced discussion in the first session with the thesis that we are justified in using literature as an accompaniment to or basis for composition and suggested that the workshop focus on *how* literature may be or ought to be used with or as an approach to composition. Two major points emerged from the first session: first, that besides providing topics and perhaps subject matter for composition, literature may serve as a "controlling world of experience accessible to each student in the class, as well as to the instructor"; second, that teaching composition from literature generally draws upon the strongest enthusiasms and competence of the typical instructor.

Participants in discussion seemed to support two quite different principles in the use of literature for composition: some saw the primary purpose of writing from literature to lie in close intellectual analysis and in the sensitivity to diction and tone it may produce beyond what may usually be done with most expository prose. Others supported what was referred to as a "springboard approach," using the vicarious experiences of literature as a stimulus to writing about experiences and attitudes from the student's own life. Regardless of approach, however, all workshop members felt that little technical terminology was necessary, although it was pointed out that

many useful terms are not specialized, such as *setting, suspense,* and *characterization,* as contrasted with specialized terms, such as *voice.*

In the second session, two large aims of the literature-centered composition course were defined: (1) analysis of literature to create an awareness of style or strategy of writing, and (2) application of the principles previously examined in a first course based on expository essays to a new type of reading and writing in which style, tone and diction have increased emphasis. It was observed that typically a composition course using literature for its reading was not offered the student's first quarter or semester and that when scheduled, it was frequently offered to the top fifteen or twenty percent of the class. Throughout the sessions of the workshop both consultants and participants emphasized the need for both critical reading and careful introduction of writing assignments.

The workshop concurred with Mr. Bailey's statement on qualifications of instructors of composition. It was observed that the undergraduate English teacher, perhaps better than any other instructor, can give connecting significance to the student's whole undergraduate program. This being so, the increasing use of graduate assistants calls for careful supervision and constant in-service training to the point that some discussants saw real merit in providing a credit course to guide graduate assistants or credit for the in-service training otherwise provided. The use of carefully prepared syllabi along with some supervision in the classroom seems imperative. One workshop member suggested the need for a teaching degree of "M. A. in teaching" or "Ph.D. in teaching" broader but less deep than the traditional M.A. and Ph.D.

Chairman: Roy Pickett, University of New Mexico

Co-Chairman: B. Bernard Cohen, University of Wichita

Recorder: Dean B. Farnsworth, Brigham Young University

Consultants: William F. Irmscher, University of Washington
William A. McQueen, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

2B. LITERATURE: COLLEGES

Workshop 2b met in three sessions, the first two sessions in discussion of aims in the freshman course, the third in consideration of qualities of teachers. These two areas of discussion, it soon became apparent, are so closely related that one could not be discussed without reference to the other, for the teacher is central, no matter what emphasis the course takes. However, assuming the right kind of teacher, the workshop participants agreed that literature is a profitable emphasis in a course with the primary goal of improving student writing. The following major points were made: (1) Literature can lead students to perceptions about life as they become emotionally involved in the reading and try to give form to their thoughts about it. (2) The teacher must first teach the student to read with understanding and enjoyment. Since literature is not meant for the classroom in the first place, the course must be loosely structured to preserve what is valued in literature. The problem for the teacher is to determine what will evoke the responses—the feelings—of the students, then let the students discover what they want to say about the work of literature and develop an order for their thoughts. (3) The student can become aware that there is no essential difference between creative and expository writing. Attempting to determine the difference between "workaday prose" and what we call literature, the participants finally stated, with some demurs, that literature is an analogue (not a model) of student writing. When workaday prose becomes forceful enough, it becomes literature. (4) There are several practical advantages in a course with emphasis on literature, including development of style from observation of good writing, provocative topics for papers, and an awareness of how experience takes on meaning through form. (5) Through literature the student can become more intensely aware of the uses of language as a communication bridge between men. (6) Some participants favored teaching contemporary literature, but this notion met with the strong objection that, after all, any good literature is contemporary. Cliché or no, literature does annihilate Time. (7) The freshman teacher

stands a better chance of being a good teacher when he handles a subject he knows (and has studied in graduate school). Literature can preserve the teacher's sanity.

In the third session the participants arrived at these qualifications for instructors: (1) The instructor must show a general knowledge of literature, critical theory, rhetoric and semantics, history and structure of the language. (2) He must show signs of professional life in a demonstrated ability to write, whether or not for publication, and in participation in professional meetings and organizations. (3) He must show a desire to teach. (4) He needs no special methodology—in the usual sense—but he needs supervision which emphasizes that every good teacher is conscious of his "method" in the classroom. The purpose of any supervision must be to help the teacher to succeed. (5) To attract and hold teachers, the teaching of freshmen can be and should be as highly thought of as any other teaching in the department. The participants damned as lamentable the practice of embalming the departmental deadwood in the freshman course: the best instructors possible should go into the course.

Chairman: Robert Lewis Weeks, Stephen F. Austin State College
Co-Chairman: Edgar V. Roberts, Hunter College, City University of New York
Recorder: Tom Hemmons, Kansas State College
Co-Recorder: Clarence A. Brown, Wisconsin State University—Eau Claire
Consultant: Leonard Wolf, San Francisco State College

2C. LITERATURE: COLLEGES OFFERING SPECIALIZED AND TWO-YEAR PROGRAMS

Participants agreed that literature can (and should) be offered in composition courses: (1) to show how language works, (2) to show how an author can structure experience, and thus (3) to show how a student can and *must* structure his own experience to be effective as a student and as a human being.

However, the level of readings must be suitable. Readings should be neither so difficult as to overwhelm them, nor a repetition of high school experiences. Recommended are Clark's *Ox-Bow Incident* and "The Portable Phonograph"; Conrad's *Heart of Darkness;* Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye;* Golding's *Lord of the Flies;* Huxley's *Brave New World;* Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons;* Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily"; and appropriate detective stories and novels.

Chairman: Saralyn R. Daly, California State College at Los Angeles
Co-Chairman: Kevin Burne, Long Beach City College
Recorder: Savin Cohen, New York City Community College
Consultant: Steven Blume, Bradley University

3A. LANGUAGE: UNIVERSITIES

At the chairman's request, the consultant, Mr. Sacks, first extended his Panel P3 remarks about the grammar of essays. He said that we need to define an essay accurately and be able to tell students what constituents will produce it and nothing else. He suggested four possible variables—subject, medium (language), technique, and communicative purpose. An adequate conception of each would let us show students how to write an essay and then alter one variable to produce a different essay. Grammar should be taught in Freshman English, he said, to develop a respect for the human mind and provide a meaningful intellectual experience. He favored generative grammar as having formulated the most fruitful questions more clearly than others: e.g., What does it mean to have language? How did one learn the grammar he knows? Such an approach can create a more intelligent attitude toward variant language patterns also because students will understand why these exist. As for the relationship of grammar study to writing skill, he said, the real problem is the student's ignorance of the grammar of an essay, not a sentence: how sentences are tied together, what a particular sentence is supposed to do in an essay.

The second meeting considered alternative approaches to language study in Freshman English: (1) learning about lexicography, history of English, grammar and usage (perhaps using a language reader) to give students some philosophy of grammar and some understanding of language change; (2) detailed, dynamic exploration of a particular grammar as an intellectual

experience; (3) the study of language as used in essays whatever their subject matter, this being the English teacher's distinctive way of looking at prose. Mr. Sacks felt that language readers give misleading, superficial views of several grammatical approaches, but studying one superior grammar can raise questions about usage in a meaningful way and provide an intellectual experience. He described an experimental course in which students first studied grammar, then analyzed the language of essays, then wrote essays. One participant questioned the inclusion of language study in a freshman course, since instructors are neither prepared nor inclined to teach it and since there is no agreement about which grammar to teach. The workshop considered this situation regrettable, believing that all English teachers should have had a serious intellectual study of grammar. It recommended an "ideal" freshman course: the first term to provide an active experience in confronting an intellectually powerful grammar of English, the second to retain the emphasis on language but concentrate on its operation in essays.

The final session agreed on these recommendations for desirable preparation in language for instructors of the freshman course: (1) Recognizing that increasingly the course is being taught by graduate assistants with only a bachelor's degree, we believe that the ideal undergraduate preparation should be at least these three courses—a sophomore introduction to language study, a junior course in modern grammar, and a senior course in the history of English—with an optional fourth course in American English. (This is desirable preparation regardless of whether the course is language oriented.) (2) All Ph.D. programs in English should include at least four graduate level language courses other than such courses as Old English.

Chairman: Janet Emig, University of Chicago
Co-Chairman: Silas Griggs, North Texas State University and Southern Methodist University
Recorder: William U. McDonald, Jr., The University of Toledo
Co-Recorder: Jean G. Pival, University of Kentucky
Consultant: Sheldon Sacks, University of California at Berkeley

3B. LANGUAGE: COLLEGES

THE AIMS OF FRESHMAN COMPOSITION (WITH EMPHASIS ON LANGUAGE)

This workshop has endorsed the concept of a composition *program* (a series of courses) rather than a composition *course,* reflecting a consensus that a single course in composition is not adequate.

Any composition program must have as one of its aims the improvement of the student's writing, which might suggest that the simple expedient of discovering *how people write* would suffice as content for the program. But knowing *how people write* is not enough, and the acquisition of a bag of practical tricks is not what is meant by emphasis on language.

The study of language is conceived as a liberal study, and the important thing is to discover an objective description of the language—to know how the language works. A composition program with emphasis on language should attempt to provide the student with the results of linguistic analysis, rather than with a mastery of the specific tools and techniques of the professional linguist. The service aspect of the program should be subordinated, and the naive assumption that good writing (or even improved writing) is a natural consequence of learning grammar must be excoriated.

A good composition program must develop a realistic attitude toward language, recognizing on one hand the facts of twentieth century English, and on the other hand an imposing heritage. At the same time, however, it is necessary to exercise restraint, particularly in the attempt to reduce this attitude to a formula. Such encapsulation is misleading to the student, who is much less in need of advice and gimmicks for improving his linguistic etiquette than for a comprehensive analysis of the nature and function of his language.

Emphasis on language does not imply that the subject matter of a composition program must be *language.* There was strong feeling that concentrating on language might be a mistake, because it provides no intellectual "itch," and consensus was that language as the subject matter for a course was at most optional, and never a requirement.

Finally, emphasis on language does not

imply the exclusion of rhetoric. It was felt that one shortcoming of the linguistic approach has been that most grammatical analyses have been limited to the sentence. Ultimately, a composition program must attain a larger framework, hopefully one in which it is possible to find discourse analysis merging with rhetoric.

NECESSARY QUALIFICATIONS FOR FRESHMAN ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS

The workshop recognized that it would be more realistic to conceive of the college freshman composition instructor as a full time person having only the baccalaureate and as having little or no previous experience, since colleges do not have access (as do many universities) to a supply of doctoral candidates to serve part-time as graduate assistants. In light of this, the workshop developed a statement embracing a set of minimum qualifications for the AB and an in-service training program.

1. Included in the AB degree (or in the candidate's education previous to his being hired)
   - A. Minimum of courses in language
     - (1) descriptive linguistics or a description of English, but in either case specifying exposure to at least two systems of grammatical analysis.
     - (2) history of the English language.
   - B. Extensive practical training controlled by the English Department, and the immediate responsibility of a qualified member of the English Department.
     - (1) discussion of problems, with particular attention to the aims of a composition course.
     - (2) a course in the evaluation of freshman papers, including some first-hand experience in reading and grading actual papers.
2. After the AB (These are conditions that would be set down for inexperienced people at the time they are hired.)
   - A. Qualifying exam (e.g., reading and grading a representative set of papers.)
   - B. Careful supervision and professional up-grading
     - (1) frequent classroom visitation.
     - (2) frequent review of reading techniques and grading standards.
     - (3) study of problems and methods (with a qualified member of the English Department).

Chairman: Ross M. Jewell, State College of Iowa
Co-Chairman: Virginia McDavid, Illinois Teachers College, Chicago—South
Recorder: Robert B. Glenn, New York State University College, Cortland
Co-Recorder: Dale L. Midland, Northwest Missouri State College
Consultant: James Barry, Loyola University of Chicago

4A (combined with 4B and 4C). COMMUNICATIONS

Chairman Harold Allen outlined the history of the communications discipline (with which he has been associated for 25 years). He said he was disturbed by the ready acceptance of certain proponents to offer it the kiss of death, and by the tendency of others to assume that this discipline could exist in a healthy state, either without composition or without speech. He saw no basis for a division of its several disciplines, and argued that communications was a legitimate area for research, tenure, prestige and promotion, or else there would be no development.

Eric Zale outlined the specific reasons for the failure of communications at one large midwestern university (reasons which were echoed by other workshop participants and were accepted as general): (1) failure of the department charged with teaching it to develop a meaningful amalgam of speech and composition techniques; (2) lack of instructors with combined ability in composition and speech; usually, speech teachers stressed speech to the detriment of composition, and writing teachers stressed composition to the detriment of speech; a rare few handled both disciplines equally well, but none was knowledgeable about

communication theory; (3) lack of interest and knowledge in the discipline on the part of the department head and (4) lack of any clear directive concerning the desired amalgam.

Edward Dillinger (Texas) said that the theory of communications was taught only to upper classmen and graduates, although the traditional freshman composition course included syntactics, semantics and pragmatics plus (hopefully) the new concepts of rhetoric and linguistics. Donald Bryan (Minnesota) said that communications (an inter-department elective) was one of three courses offered to satisfy the usual freshman requirement. He warned of two pitfalls of the course: (1) separate emphasis on the individual skills and (2) offering it as a service to other departments. The subject matter of the course should be English language and rhetoric, with all practical assignments designed to extend and reinforce communication as a means to learning.

John Bowers (Iowa) reported that communications dealt with the English language, first, and with mass media, second. The content and development should come out of communication research, and a strong emphasis on current trends supported by rhetorical skills. Success at Iowa, he said, was due largely to a successful amalgam of writing and speaking. One definite difficulty to success in the course he said, is the problem of finding teachers who will readily accept a job alien to their chosen fields. Donald Peel (Montana State) said that where the English and Speech departments are combined, it is assumed that instructors are able to teach both speech and composition, and to understand mass communication theory. Margaret Wisecap (Boulder, Colo., High School) said that the question of how to combine composition and speech effectively is far more urgent on the secondary level, and that high school teachers needed a set of principles, goals and guidelines, if the universities are to benefit.

Maj. Kenneth Weber (Airforce Prep School) combines an interesting potpourri of skills and methods in preparing youths for the Academy, including extra reading for the deficient, and toastmaster activity, both after hours. James Kinneavy (Texas) insisted on the need to synthesize current ideas in communication in order to determine ultimate aims of the course. One reason for the decline of the course has been that we have labored on means as goals." Another is that many teachers fail to utilize all the vital language arts. Arthur Shumaker (DePauw) believes that any instructor can teach speech or composition (and, therefore, communication) from a good textbook (a statement which was contested by the communication scholars).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Allen saw the future of communications related to research in six major fields: paralinguistics (vocal features in speech), kinesics (body movements of communicants), proximics (use of space by communicants), haptics (science of body touch), psycho-linguistics and rhetoric. He urged that a greater effort was required to assimilate new developments and materials in all disciplines related to communications.

Zale recommended (1) that communications embrace the work of Kenneth L. Pike and his two associates at CRLLB, Richard E. Young and Alton L. Becker, on Tagmemics (particularly in regards the study of units beyond the sentence), and (2) that it could profit from research on information theory and in the area of verbal behavior and learning.

Bowers urged that communications be treated aggressively as a healthy discipline with principles, a vocabulary, and a definite future. Bryan said that teachers must keep abreast of developments in all disciplines related to communications, if the course is to survive. Kinneavy saw the need to synthesize ideas from all the relevant language arts, except logic and rhetoric, which, he insisted, were not in the province of the English teacher.

Chairman: Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota
Co-Chairman: Joseph R. Riley, Memphis State University
Recorder: Eric M. Zale, Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior, University of Michigan
Consultant: John W. Bowers, University of Iowa

5C. IDEAS AND ISSUES: COLLEGES OFFERING SPECIALIZED AND TWO-YEAR PROGRAMS

AIMS OF COMPOSITION COURSES

As a supplement to the general assembly

and panel presentation, Mr. Lander described Shoreline College, English courses offered, initial placement procedures, student progression from lower to more advanced courses, and the aims of remedial and specialized programs. Mr. Danielson offered a similar description of Grossmont College. These informal presentations pointed up the heterogeneity of the students in the two-year colleges. Acknowledging this fact, the workshop participants agreed that the discussion should be restricted primarily to the students immediately involved in those programs which are terminal and remedial in nature. Group consensus included the following points: (1) that developing the ability to write plain factual prose is important for all students; (2) that the problem of combining practical training with substantive study remains unsolved and that this problem is especially critical in the two-year college; (3) that the problem of defining aims for a variety of students in a variety of courses in a variety of institutions is impracticable; (4) that the problem of respecting the aims of composition while organizing the course with a focus on ideas and issues is considerably different at the remedial and terminal levels than it is at the transfer level.

Admitting that conflicting views concerning the initial course in English do exist, the group raised questions as follows: (1) Is it obligatory that the English department organize its composition course to accommodate the service concept or the specialized composition requirements of the other departments? (2) Is it practical for the first course in composition to emphasize grammar? The group noted the Weingarten study evidence that indicates *gross* dependence on grammar as content and that this content defines aims. (3) Is it imperative that the first course in composition with a focus on ideas and issues require extensive reading? Although many students have severe reading handicaps, they can achieve some sense of engagement through viewing carefully selected films, attending plays, and learning from other media which they face.

The group agreed that the aims of a composition course should reflect precisely what students must acquire as skills and knowledge by the end of the course to prepare them for the kind of world they will live in, one marked by technological advancement and by sharp sociological changes.

QUALIFICATIONS OF FRESHMAN COMPOSITION INSTRUCTORS

The participants agreed that most of the issues in defining the necessary qualifications of the composition instructor in the junior college are carefully outlined in the Tempe report on the junior college (pages 118 to 123); but the group emphasized that, in addition to the liberal education needed to teach composition with an emphasis on ideas and issues, the instructor needs some specific training in the teaching of reading.

Finally, the participants observed that the English instructor in a two-year college may be asked to teach courses to students from the highest to the lowest levels of preparation and from the widest variety of ethnic and social backgrounds. Such a situation has implications for teacher preparation and improvement at several levels: 1) The four-year colleges and universities presently need to develop and offer new courses in language and composition as rapidly as possible. (2) The two-year college faculties need to develop independently within the department or cooperatively with other institutions and systems a continuing program of in-service education to cope with the immediate problems confronting the composition teacher. (3) The two-year colleges must develop and/or strengthen their instructional resources.

Chairman: Robert W. Danielson, Grossmont College
Co-Chairman: Richard Lander, Shoreline Community College
Recorder: Evelyn H. Roberts, Meramec Community College
Consultant: Lt. Col. Jack L. Capps, Military Academy, West Point

6-12C: Instruction of Special Types of Students

6. SUPERIOR FRESHMEN

Most of the discussion in this workshop focused on two questions:

1. What is a superior freshman? (His existence was taken for granted.)
2. How effectively does the tutorial

method teach the superior freshman to write clearly?

There was general agreement that high college board scores and good high school grades do not in themselves insure superiority. Professor Kiely suggested that although the highly verbal student usually had few problems with basic mechanics, possessed a large vocabulary, and was well read, he was frequently a stuffy conformist. The qualities universally sought in the "super-freshman" are self-motivation, creativity ("inventiveness" according to Professor Albrecht), and a willingness to rebel against prescribed regulations. The workshop raised but did not resolve the problem implicit in this discussion. That is, if the superior student cannot be selected through tests and grades, how is he found? Professor Piehler suggested somewhat radically that any student willing to participate in tutorial work was by definition superior.

The idea of using the tutorial method to teach composition seemed to meet with general favor; however, there was spirited discussion of the method's cost, the professor's role vis-à-vis the student, the subject matter covered, and the results produced. The problem of cost is overcome by dividing the normal class of twenty into four groups of five students, each group meeting with the instructor once a week. Such a division requires an extra hour in class from each instructor, but costs no more than a regular section. The choice of subject matter is left to each teacher's discretion; the teacher's role is one of participant-guide rather than seer-dictator. Demands for objective evidence that the tutorial method does indeed produce superior writing could hardly be met at the workshop. The consultants emphatically stated, however, that the results were impressive and urged the workshop members to exercise a leap of faith. Before the workshop adjourned *sine die*, it was suggested that separate sessions on tutorials be placed on next year's agenda.

Chairman: Suzanne M. Wilson, California State College, Long Beach
Co-Chairman: Joseph H. Friend, Western Reserve University
Recorder: Ladell Payne, Claremont Men's College
Co-Recorder: Samuel J. Rogal, Iowa State University
Consultants: Robert C. Albrecht, University of Chicago
Robert Kiely, Harvard University
Paul Piehler, University of California, Berkeley

7. CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED

The first session of the workshop was devoted to a discussion of dialect and vocabulary and what the teacher of the disadvantaged can do about these as he seeks to involve his student in the act of writing.

Out of the discussion came the following conclusions:

1. Regardless of his origin, the culturally deprived student requires a greater opinion of himself.
2. The needs and requirements of the teacher of the disadvantaged cover a wide range on the different levels.
3. The teacher of the disadvantaged must seek to enlarge the student's language abilities by increasing his powers of communication.
4. The relationship between vocabulary and experience is vital. The teacher of the disadvantaged must use what the student knows and must stretch it to help him grow.
5. The disadvantaged needs more encouragement to verbalize beyond his normal social level of experience.
6. The disadvantaged requires a well-structured program in which specific provision is made for written application of expanded vocabulary and experience—as soon as the time is ripe for such application.
7. The program for the teaching of the disadvantaged should provide for the development of logical understanding and conceptual understanding.

Chairman Donald Hogan opened the second session by submitting for consideration the idea that the problem of the disadvantaged be approached from the origins of the problem—the pre-school child. Chairman Hogan referred to studies which show that it is possible to bring culturally deprived children up to the level of children who are not culturally deprived. The dis-

cussion which ensued pointed up the fact that the responsibility for bridging the gap evident in the disadvantaged is one that lies on all levels, including the college. From this discussion, the participant proceeded to consider the specific problem which faces the college teacher:how to get the disadvantaged to become involved in the act of creating a composition.

Basic conclusions drawn at the close of the workshop were as follows:

1. The disadvantaged student must be given a feeling of acceptance and a sense of dignity.
2. He must be permitted to use what he has and knows as the starting point from which he is to expand his communication powers.
3. He must be given the opportunity to become involved in writing experiences which offer him some actual and immediate proof of his achievement.

Chairman: Donald Hogan, University of Illinois
Co-Chairman: George E. Gravel, John Carroll University
Recorder: Anne M. Henderson, Elizabeth City State College
Consultants: Anne L. Campbell, Prairie View A & M College
Robert Christin, Institute for Services to Education, American Council on Education
J. Marie McCleary, Texas Southern University

9. STUDENTS NEEDING REMEDIAL HELP

Professor Falk Johnson reported that he has had some success with teaching spelling through self instruction. As a result of his method, which involved all out-of-class work, his students evidenced about a 50% improvement in spelling, based on scores made on a post-test as compared to those on a pre-test. He added that follow-up work after such an initial gain is very important if the students are to maintain their proficiency.

Nearly all those present in the workshop indicated that their schools spotted remedial English students through initial placement tests. Of those responding, nearly half indicated the use of an objective test, and most of those remaining indicated the use of a combination of scores, based on English proficiency tests and intelligence-achievement tests, for purposes of placement. Participants from schools using the ACT testing program reported that the cut-off scores ranged from the fifteenth through eighteenth percentiles.

A few people from four-year institutions indicated that all remedial work in English had been eliminated from their schools, and students needing remedial work of any scope were sent to a junior college for instruction. In those four-year institutions still offering remedial work, most offered a special course, as opposed to supplementary work as part of the standard freshman English course. Most people from the junior colleges also reported separate remedial courses, much like those at the four-year institutions. One teacher reported that her school sends out letters to all entering freshmen warning them of possible deficiencies, and special remedial work is offered for these pupils during the summer. She added, however, that few students availed themselves of this opportunity.

Motivation was admitted as being one of the major problems with remedial English students. Two general suggestions were made to motivate students. One was to be as positive as possible in the criticism of the writer, thus giving him confidence in himself. Another was to give frequent essays and examinations, so that the students will maintain their motivation over a long period of time.

Finally, the workshop participants discussed the problem of who is to teach the remedial English course. One junior college department chairman hoped that she could find people available who were especially trained to deal with this type of student, but most of those present admitted that this was indeed a difficult person to find. In most cases the remedial course is "farmed out" to all members of the staff, and because of the undesirability of teaching the course most remedial sections are assigned to new faculty members. This problem of finding people interested in teaching remedial English was acknowledged as one of the main problems of this area, and most of those present at the workshop were rather pessimistic about a solution being found.

Dr. Jones concluded the session by saying

that remedial English has indeed offered us more failure than success, judging from the comments made at the workshop. He added that this problem is best left to the two-year community colleges to handle. A few of the community college teachers mentioned that they believed some solution might be sought through programmed instruction, or perhaps through more personalized instruction. But these areas need a great deal of research and development before they can offer any promise.

Chairman: Everett L. Jones, University of California at Los Angeles
Co-Chairman: Gregory Cowan, Clark College
Recorder: Alan L. Slay, Florissant Valley Community College
Co-Recorder: Sylvia Huete, Dillard University
Consultants: Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Louise B. Kelly, University of Iowa
Dorothy Whitted, Ohio Wesleyan University

10. NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES

The workshop demonstrated very clearly the need for a continued dialogue among junior college faculty to clarify terminology, the position, the philosophy, and the substance of junior college composition programs from a state, regional, and national point of view. This basic "fact of life" became evident very quickly as there was no unanimity as to meaning of "non transfer," "terminal," or "remedial" student. To simplify matters the recorders have agreed arbitrarily to use the term "junior college" in place of all other two-year institutional descriptives.

The workshop group, by and large found itself in agreement with Dr. James Sledd's broad comments that writing was the main business of our composition classes and that the writing of work-a-day prose (if it is to meet the needs of junior college students) requires, "a variety of courses in a variety of schools to meet the needs of a variety of students."

The following general observations were made:

Terminal courses (content) at the junior college level should *never* underestimate the potential of the student. All non-transfer programs should start with substance of merit. There should be course depth at *all* levels. The emphasis at the non-transfer level should be on student needs. The content of any one, two, or three-track course has to stimulate the student according to his ability.

The *humanistic* approach is a vital part of any English program. It seems important that junior college teachers recognize the philosophy for that level, i.e., a junior college program is not a "junior grade 'Ivy League.'" It is not a miniature Harvard University.

The mobility of our great national industrial programs requires oft-times that students change jobs completely, sometimes within a five or six-year span. Junior College English programs are better able to offer and ought to offer a greater degree of flexibility to meet such challenges.

The following resolutions were adopted unanimously by the Workshop on Non-transfer Students in Junior Colleges:

1. We affirm the need for *challenging* English programs at a number of levels of student ability and achievement.
2. We recommend the establishment of terminal Junior College English programs wherever sufficient need exists, recognizing that such programs will vary considerably, depending on the needs of different communities.
3. We recommend that terminal Junior College English programs emphasize total effectiveness *more* than mere mechanical correctness.
4. We recommend that the study of semantics, mass media, and literature be considered for inclusion in the Terminal program.
5. We recommend that the CCCC and NCTE sponsor a continued research study of terminal English programs in Junior Colleges.
6. We commend the continued support of annual Junior College Regional Workshops. We recommend that Junior College programs for CCCC meetings be planned from recommendations coming from a joint meeting of workshop representatives.
7. The presiding panel members and co-recorder recommend additionally that the next CCCC conference pro-

vide time for a session on textbook usage, analysis, and comparison.

Chairman: Vincent Ryan Ruggiero, SUNY Agricultural and Technical College
Co-Chairman: Elmer B. Fetscher, Miami-Dade Junior College
Recorder: J. Richard Christian, San Jose City College
Co-Recorder: Floyd Turner, Everett Junior College
Consultants: Jean Hodgin, Corning Community College
Blenda Kuhlman, Butler County Community Junior College
Raymond D. Liedlich, Fullerton Junior College

11. ADULT STUDENTS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES AND EVENING SCHOOLS.

Poor attendance forced us to cancel the afternoon workshop session, and the panel members present at the morning meeting decided to meet informally later in the day rather than attend the scheduled second workshop. Nevertheless, the formal meetings were fruitful. Prof. Johnson summarized that part of the workshop which turned on identifying and defining the problems of adult students, and on exchanges of information about curricula and teaching methods. This report represented the unanimous conviction of the assembled panelists that the federal government's new G.I. Bill of Rights and state and local governments' increasing demands for urban "work-study" and job retraining programs will, in the very near future, place many more adults in junior and community colleges than have ever been enrolled there before.

The workshop participants agreed, again unanimously, (a) that the CCCC should remind college administrators, faculty members and state education coordinators of the imminence of this problem; (b) that since a large influx of adult students will make new programs, larger plants and larger faculties absolutely necessary in many curricular areas, federal, state and local governments should be asked to bear the cost of these improvements (This issue alone, many of the panelists felt, would have increased attendance considerably at P11 and W11 if more CCCC members had been aware of it.); and (c) that detailed studies be made of the unique demands made on Junior College and Community College programs by new veterans' benefits and job-retraining projects. Such studies will be essential for future program planning.

Chairman: Lois Margaret Smith, Taft College
Co-Chairman: Helen D. Barnes, Pasadena City College
Recorder: Elma Johnson, Flint Junior College
Co-Recorder: Stuart Astor, Adelphi University
Consultants: Dorothea Fry, California State College at Los Angeles
Robert E. Haverkamp, Central YMCA Community College, Chicago

12A. ADVANCED COMPOSITION FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

The two meetings of Workshop 12-A were planned to broach a problem that exists perhaps mainly because it is also one generally ignored: i.e., the unacknowledged relevance of advanced composition to the training of all elementary teachers. It was thus symptomatic that the title of the Workshop—"Advanced Composition for Prospective Elementary School Teachers"—attracted virtually no one to the first meeting. Accordingly, Chairman Paul A. Olson adjourned the staff to the adjoining room, where a large crowd had turned out for a similar Workshop directed to secondary teachers, reported elsewhere.

At the afternoon meeting, attended by twelve to fifteen persons, Consultant Richard Larson pointed up the existing problem by reporting results of his recent poll of representative teacher-training programs. Those results, soon to be published, only substantiate what all of us have known all along—e.g., that most such programs require few if any courses in language or writing beyond freshman composition, even though the elementary teacher is often primarily a teacher of language arts. If unsurprising, Mr. Larson's statistics are none the less appalling. As he observed, one wonders just *why*—much less *how*—language arts teachers ever become language arts teachers at all.

Following the report, Mr. Olson went on to engage the group in a larger problem, one that complicates the first, namely, the great shortage of credentialed authorities to provide the necessary training. Even if

granted the opportunity to do so, the profession could not adequately meet the demand for specialists knowledgeable enough in three very special areas, usually separate from or peripheral to the background of a college English department faculty: (1) the unique linguistics of children's communication, (2) the psychology of language learning in children, (3) the problems posed by various genres in teaching reading and writing to children.

The Workshop urged strongly an increase in long-term NDEA institutes to reorient the accepted viewpoint of what has become an established pattern in elementary teacher-training programs. Most agreed that "We are dealing with a reshuffling jobs," as Mr. Olson had earlier remarked in his *Introduction to the Preliminary Report of the USOE Conference* (Lincoln, Nebbraska: Center for Continuing Education, March, 1966). That report itself bespeaks the consensus of the Workshop participants as well as the pressing need for more and greater involvement within the profession.

Chairman: Paul A. Olson, University of Nebraska
Co-Chairman: Martha L. Brockman, San Fernando Valley State College
Recorder: Robert A. Charles, Alaska Methodist University
Co-Recorder: Richard J. Zbaracki, Iowa State University
Consultant: Richard Larson, University of Hawaii

12B. ADVANCED COMPOSITION FOR PROSPECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Three main questions were discussed in the morning session: 1. Is there a need for an Advanced Composition course for future high school teachers of composition? 2. What skills does the high school want the prospective teacher of composition to bring with him from Advanced Composition? 3. How can the Advanced Composition class provide the prospective teacher with these skills? The consensus seemed to be that the high school feels that an Advanced Composition course (or its equivalent) is necessary. Too many new teachers, it was felt, come to their jobs able to analyze literature but unable to do a satisfactory job with composition. A member of the workshop pointed out that teachers in service have benefited from the various institutes have have been held for them in which they have received the equivalent of an Advanced Composition course. Prospective teachers could gain the same benefits before leaving college.

The high school wants the new teacher to be able to write well (and to understand the process he goes through when he writes), to be able to make writing assignments that high school pupils will find exciting or stimulating, and to be able to evaluate pupils' writing in some depth; e.g., he should be able to go beyond the marking of errors to such things as the discussion of structure and the appropriateness of form. The ways in which the group felt the Advanced Composition course could help the prospective teacher gain these skills were varied. We seemed to agree that the teacher of the Advanced Composition course should make assignments with great care, that he should attempt to involve students in their essays so that the result would be an expression of thoughts that the student really wanted to express. The achievement of this involvement, it was suggested, could come about through discussion of problems or controversial issues, through the use of examination of the kinds of problems raised by Rollo May and Carl Rogers, through the establishment of the class as the audience (with papers to be read aloud by the writer to the class for criticism), and through emphasis on thinking as an essential to writing. It was suggested that students can learn much about the forms of writing by writing for a journalism class. Also, members of the workshop suggested that prospective teachers should plan to write with their pupils and to expose their work to pupil criticism. Finally, a member suggested using the overhead projector in the Advanced Composition class to show how a student's beginning and ending paragraphs are related and to demonstrate (by supplying a beginning sentence and inviting one student to add a second sentence and another to add a third) the relationship of sentence to sentence in good writing.

Chairman: J. J. Lamberts, Arizona State University

Recorder: Robert W. Rounds, State University College, Oneonta, N. Y.
Co-Recorder: Esther L. H. Williams, Wilmington (Ohio) High School
Consultant: Wallace W. Douglas, Northwestern University

12C. ADVANCED COMPOSITION FOR PROSPECTIVE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENGLISH TEACHERS

A course in advanced composition for prospective college and university teachers is valuable only if the purpose of such a course has been defined; such definition is best accomplished by finding out the needs of the graduate students, both teaching assistants and non-teaching students. Two basic needs would be (1) to help the graduate student in his own writing and (2) to help the assistant in the basic composition course for which he is likely to be responsible. The teaching assistant probably needs the course for both of these reasons; the non-teaching student probably would need it for the first reason.

In effect now are three different courses in which the graduate student receives training in composition. (1) The teaching assistant is asked to fulfill the assignments which are given the freshman student; he submits his paper to a fellow assistant who grades it and comments on it as he would a freshman theme. This course strengthens the judgment-making faculties of the advanced student and helps him in his own writing. (2) The teaching assistant is given a course similar to the undergraduate course in advanced composition; however, the instructor places greater emphasis on the components of rhetoric, uses the field theory of composition to help the assistant in his own writing and teaching, and gives the assistant gimmicks to help him teach his freshman students. (3) The teaching assistant is taught composition only incidentally in a course preparing him to meet the composition problems of freshman English; the instructor uses grading sessions and seminar papers to help his students improve their own writing and to give them a departmental standard for theme grading.

If a course in advanced composition is to be required of graduate students, and it is probable that one *should* be required of non-teaching graduate students, it must accomplish at least three things: (1) it must furnish the prospective teacher with some system to give him self-confidence and to give form to his own composition course; (2) it must enable the prospective teacher to recognize that there are many systems and methods for teaching composition and that no one is superior to another; (3) it must provide the prospective teacher with a buffet of systems from which he can choose one compatible with himself and his own teaching of freshman composition.

Chairman: W. Robert Lawyer, Western Washington State College
Co-Chairman: Patricia Ingle, Midwestern University
Recorder: David Hettich, University of Nevada
Consultant: S. Leonard Rubinstein, Pennsylvania State University

13-17: Assigning and Marking Compositions

13. NARRATIVE AND DESCRIPTIVE PAPERS

Whether description and narration should be taught at all in the typical freshman composition course was the first question raised during this seminar. Opponents argued that there is too little time in the typical freshman program for descriptive and narrative assignments, that freshmen are better occupied writing and re-writing the more "practical" forms of exposition and argumentation and in learning to write the research paper. Proponents argued that descriptive and narrative assignments were just as "practical" as expository and argumentative assignments in teaching such values as precision and clarity of utterance. Both groups, in general, agreed that descriptive and narrative assignments, if made at all, should be made and graded as parts of bigger assignments, i.e., of the short story or of essay assignments such as the process description.

With the exception of one participant who argued that the use of the opaque projector made the class room teaching of writing effective, most participants agreed that teaching writing in the class room was largely a waste of time. "A few minutes of tutorial instruction in writing is worth more than hours in the class room," was the

dominant sentiment at this workshop. And participants recommended that administrations cooperate with writing instructors in trying to replace useless classroom instruction with tutorial instruction. Several participants pointed out that tutorial instruction, contrary to general opinion, is possible even with relatively large writing classes, i.e., twenty students. Participants also suggested that writing teachers should be writers themselves, that they should be able to perfect their students' imperfect composition by re-writing that composition. That such teachers are uncommon and should be encouraged by universities—i.e., promoted whether or not they have the Ph.D., a degree which some say doesn't necessarily produce effective writing teachers—was recommended by the participants, though in the tone of futility which usually accompanies that recommendation.

Chairman: Stephen Minot, Trinity College
Co-Chairman: Jacqueline Burke, Drew University
Recorder: James Degnan, University of Santa Clara
Co-Recorder: Malcolm Glass, Austin Peay College

14. EXPOSITORY PAPERS

Much of the workshop's discussion concerned uniformity of and application of grading standards. Working with samples of student writing, attendees were able to arrive at a consensus on above-average papers more easily than on writing of average or below-average quality. While acknowledging the usefulness of an ideal "absolute standard," the group recognized the problems which make even local standards difficult (though not impossible) to apply: foreign students; differentiation of in-class and out-of-class compositions; remedial and other abnormal groupings; the influence of administrative use of "D" as a failing grade; and such variations as the teacher may admit because of student improvement, type of assignment, or time in the semester. Discussion also pointed up the need to mark papers for maximum pedagogical effectiveness, and the need to make writing assignments in which the student has some commitment beyond the expression of rhetorical principles under study.

Chairman: J. Sherwood Weber, Pratt Institute
Co-Chairman: Henry B. Rule, Lamar State College
Recorder: Donald Eulert, Sandia Corporation

15. ARGUMENTATIVE PAPERS

Opening statements at the morning session defined the argumentative paper and its role in the freshman composition course. Specifically, the workshop addressed itself to the problems of assigning and evaluating argumentative papers. Several of the approximately thirty college and high school teachers present also contributed their understanding and appreciation of this type of assignment.

Professor Gaston and other members of the panel pointed out the danger of allowing argumentation to become little more than debate. He offered, as a working definition, the suggestion that argumentation is "the valid use of evidence and the accurate exercise of reasoning." It was agreed that such a definition identified a necessary tool (evidence) and an essential approach (reason). Added to the definition was the statement that a condition of tension between writer and reader must exist. The argument may offer objective interpretation and subjective opinion in order to express a disagreement; and, it may also attempt to persuade an audience to adopt a new attitude, belief, position, or policy. This type of tension is what separates argumentative writing from exposition.

Briefly discussed was the Aristotelian differentiation made to demonstrate that persuasion differs from argument in its tendency toward a heavier reliance upon emotional appeals. All members of the panel agreed that the important consideration was the inclusion of factual, verifiable evidence, or concrete details, to support the argument. The valid use of evidence and the accurate exercise of reason are of prime importance in the writing of argumentation.

During the afternoon session, the panel supplied copies of assignments and student argumentative papers to the audience. Each member explained his approach to the grading of these papers. Introduced was the idea of morality as it emerged from arguments offered by college freshmen. The problem of evaluating ethical proof (ethos) and differentiating from

pathetic proof (pathos) was discussed at length. An important distinction was made between "prejudice," to "pre-judge," and "bias," to hold a position after careful investigation of all available information.

During the last few minutes of the afternoon session, the chairman distributed a "Criteria and Score Sheet for Rating Themes," currently in use at Stephen F. Austin State College. Grading of the individual theme is based on a scale of one-hundred percent. Content accounts for thirty percent; organization, thirty percent; sentences, twenty percent; and mechanics, twenty percent. The score sheet is useful not only for argumentative papers, but also for expository or evaluative assignments.

Participants agreed that the teaching of argumentation in the freshman composition class is of importance, particularly in the development of accurate reasoning. This is one of the prime areas in which the freshman student is aided in developing the ability to see and evaluate the world around him.

Chairman: Dennis M. Jones, Luther College
Co-Chairman: Morton L. Ross, University of Wyoming
Recorder: Ted N. Weissbuch, California State Polytechnic
Co-Recorder: Richard Hawkins, Clark College
Consultant: Edwin W. Gaston, Jr., Stephen F. Austin State College

16. CRITICAL PAPERS

Discussion at the Workshop's first meeting dealt largely with the nature of critical writing, that is, a definition of the characteristics of a compoistion legitimately called "critical." This discussion followed Professor Friedrich's remarks in which he emphasized the qualities of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation essential to critical writing, based upon careful reading, precise understanding, and intensive thinking. He stressed the need for close "compositional criticism" as a part of the training in writing, analogous to the study of literary criticism as a part of the study of literature. Professor Friedrich emphasized the importance of clearly defined, critically oriented writing assignments as a means of helping the student to think and write critically, and he illustrated his point with sample assignments which he has used successfully.

The afternoon session was devoted to Professor Weese's presentation of a rationale for basing a freshman course in writing wholly upon the analytical study of literature, beginning with the study of poetry. Agreeing with Professor Friedrich that critical writing involves analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, he pointed out that these are required for the kind of literary analysis which must precede an appreciation of the esthetic qualities of a literary work. Precision in assignment is achieved by focusing consistently on the meaningful interaction of the components of the literary work being studied. Professor Weese then demonstrated his use of a tape recorder in grading freshman essays. For each essay Professor Weese prepares a fifteen-minute taped critique in which he discusses organizational and substantive weaknesses and suggests improvements.

At the request of several of the Workshop members a third meeting was scheduled for Saturday morning to continue the discussion of methods, objectives, and problems involved in basing a composition course on the study of literature. It appeared to be the general feeling of delegates attending this Workshop that in future programs the time allocated to the Workshops might be increased, either by lengthening the sessions or by scheduling additional meetings.

Chairman: Wilfred A. Ferrell, Arizona State University
Co-Chairman: Gerhard Friedrich, The California State Colleges
Recorder: Walter Weese, Drake University
Co-Recorder: Thelma W. Kauffman, Colorado Woman's College

17 (combined with 8). TECHNICAL PAPERS: VOCATIONAL, BUSINESS, AND ENGINEERING STUDENTS

Because W8 and W17 had the same participants, who turned to the same topics, the chairman ruled that three sessions were sufficient, two of W8 and one of W17. The present report treats all three sessions as one unit, associating the ideas on each topic with the consultant or participant who initiated the topic and not distinguishing his responses to questions.

The broadest topic concerned patterns of procedure through a course in technical

writing. Professor Gould: the course should not anticipate on-job practices (such as the memo), which are always changing; it should present basic theory, not special forms. Professor Fiskin: start with attention to over-all purpose and structure, not with the sentence or with mechanics; treat classifications and sequences in terms of processes, usually arranged chronologically; when down to the sentence, stress simply its relation to the whole unit.

Reading models, diction, grammar, and mechanics also received substantial discussion. Professor Passe: readings can be used to improve writing both directly as models, including models for popularizing technical subjects, and indirectly by increasing logic-perception and awareness of structure. Professor Mullen: the problem of diction—which appears in use of the common vocabulary, not the technical—is also best met by reading, with intense focus on word-meanings in context; but to explain to a student the nature of his particular errors in diction remains a problem. Professor Johnson: among available grammars, transformational is best for young students of writing; whether or not it has the most utility for learning usage, it alone is organic, carrying the mind along the true lines of relationship between the forms and the thoughts; with its parallel to computer-operation, it alone points in the direction the future will take. Mr. Miller: mechanics, including spelling, is an expensive problem to industrial directors of writing, not a fetish; the extensive rewriting needed because of researchers' errors in English hurts the researchers' morale; team-writing, one man for content with another just for language, is the only solution until colleges train better.

How to keep writing done for other departments at the level the student can reach for the English department? Robert Pearsall: insist that other instructors comment and grade on the usage and rhetoric in their students' writing; at first they feel incompetent and over-worked but they learn; perhaps, though, only a military college can muster the force needed to overcome the first reactions.

How can the language and structure of highly technical papers be judged by English instructors who don't know the subject-matter? Professor Fryxell: it can't; perhaps the whole teaching job should be turned over to the technologists, though this deprives the student of the special competence and diversified audience he works with in an English class; perhaps a better answer is to have the student technologists edit a report in depth under direction of an instructor of English.

Chairman: Michael E. Adelstein, University of Kentucky
Recorder: Samuel K. Workman, Newark College of Engineering
Consultants: A. M. I. Fiskin, Drake University
William B. Mullen, Georgia Institute of Technology
Harry E. Hand, U. S. Air Force Institute of Technology
Thomas E. Pearsall, U. S. Air Force Academy
Burton L. Fryxell, Michigan Technological University

19. TEACHING MACHINES AND PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION

Teaching machines were virtually ignored in the lively discussion which developed on programed learning and the programed texts currently available in the teaching of English. One speaker pointed out that if the student errs, the programer flunks and in the opinion of several at the workshop, most programers have failed to develop materials that have met with significant success in the teaching of English. Programers were repeatedly criticized for offering English texts for publication which had not been sufficiently tested to determine their functional results; i.e., did student behavior indicate that significant learning had taken place? But there was agreement that there are heuristic possibilities for the use of programed learning in the teaching of English grammar, composition, and literature.

It was suggested that the techniques of the Air Force might be emulated in the design of programed materials and their utilization—techniques which include stringent testing of programed materials before their use in training programs. It was indicated that the Air Force will not use programed materials until trainees are able to find the correct responses on 90 percent of all programed "frames" and also demonstrate by their behavior that significant learning has taken place. If programed

texts do not meet these criteria, they are returned to their authors for additional research and revision. It was felt that few English teachers had the time or resources to devote to the research and design of programed materials which could produce such functional results.

There was also criticism concerning the limited scope of programed materials now available to English teachers. It was said that most programs were designed for the teaching of grammar and composition, whereas other areas, such as literature, received little or no attention. It would appear that many possibilities have not been explored in the development of programed materials for the teaching of English. Programing in the future might involve other factors in the learning environment: its current focus on written materials has ignored important senses in the process of learning, for example, hearing. One consultant suggested that Walt Disney's appeal to many senses and emotions could also be emulated by those who design programed texts.

There was a discernible impression from the statements of several consultants and participants in the workshop that there are no current programed texts which can be wholeheartedly endorsed for English. Yet, several at the workshop believed that the present criticisms of programed texts could also apply to more conventional textbooks in English. Some of the criteria which were suggested for a good programed text include a careful delineation of the purposes of the program, a focus on a particular segment of the student population and adequate research on its success or failure with test groups.

Chairman: Kenneth S. Rothwell, University of Kansas
Co-Chairman: Jerry E. Reed, Denver Public Schools
Recorder: Wayne G. Pirtle, Merced College
Co-Recorder: Earle G. Eley, Chicago City Junior College—Wilson Campus
Consultants: Lee Garner, Educational Research Associates
James A. Gowen, University of Kansas
Susan Meyer Markle, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

20. TEACHING COMPOSITION TO LARGE NUMBERS

This workshop was a continuation of a previous discussion. It consisted of a question-answer session concerning points that had been mentioned before. The five main topics related to the teaching of composition to large groups were the use of the overhead projector, television teaching, large group instruction followed by tutorial sessions, and the use of taped instruction and programed instruction related to large group instruction.

Dr. Schiller pointed out that he was able to reach 400 students with 5 and ½ teachers by utilizing tutorial rooms 43 hours per week for 86 sections. He felt that the principal disadvantages to his system were that the program was "boxed in" with little room to expand, although this problem would be rectified in the future, and that intellectual anemia results from tutors busy at the task of grading papers with little time for anything else. There are plans for more lectures on television, two, rather than one tutorial session per week, and more time for grading papers.

Asked how long it takes to prepare a television lesson, the figure of 10 hours for preparation was cited. It was felt that a teacher should never be asked to teach more than one class a day on television. The television lesson works best when it is closely structured. One consultant preferred to work closely with a script that was not prepared by the participant. It was emphasized that educational television is not a cheaper way to teach. Asked if educational television had to be dull, Dr. Nall pointed out that well-prepared visual aids add greatly to the presentation.

Asked how he prepared his composition program for the overhead projector, Dr. Peterson said that he took his freshman course and adapted it to the medium. Using such devices as the polarized slide, cartoons, and the actual correction of themes with the overhead can be very effective. "Entertainment can be education," he commented. Assistants in Peterson's program see the slides twice and have the weekend to prepare to teach them. Inexperienced graduate students find it a great help. One common fault is that they tend to use the projectuals at the beginning of the period. It is more effective to use them near the end of the session.

In final remarks, Dr. Schiller deplored the use of "swiss cheese" programed instruction, but felt that programed instruction that had been well-designed could be most useful as individualized instruction related to large group sessions. Dr. Peterson warned against the "lifting" of materials without copyright permissions. Often it is easier to write the material yourself than it is to get the permissions. Regarding the use of tape-recorded materials, one consultant felt that some of the programs tended to be boring. Using tapes for individualized instruction is a promising technique, but better programs need to be produced, either on a "home-made" basis or commercially.

Chairman: Philip L. Gerber, University of South Dakota
Co-Chairman: Michael J. Cardone, Henry Ford Community College
Recorder: David A. Sohn, Yale University
Consultants: Kline A. Nall, Texas Technological College
Edwin L. Peterson, University of Pittsburgh
Andrew Schiller, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

21. ADVANCED STANDING AND ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPOSITION FOR HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

Selection of students, testing, and problems relative to course content and organization were the major concerns of the workshop discussion. Participants agreed that there must be appropriate selection of Advanced Placement students: (1) The most important criterion is the recommendation of teachers over a period of years; (2) teachers should begin identification as early as possible; (3) test scores as a principal criterion should be suspect.

Mr. Serling explained the criteria used in construction of the Advanced Placement examination and the philosophy behind the examination. He explained that the test is an attempt to measure the course: background of literature, literary interpretation, and ability to think critically. He emphasized that teachers should *not* attempt to teach "for the test."

There were six general conclusions pertaining to class content and organization:

1. The present ambivalence toward works in translation needs to be reviewed.
   a. Reading translations of lyric poetry is of doubtful value.
   b. Students should be encouraged to read translations of significant novels and plays (e.g., *Crime and Punishment*).
   c. When they read the classics, students should be encouraged to compare several translations of a work.
   d. There is need for an annotated bibliography to guide readers to the best translations.
2. There is expectation that students will have read the Bible.
3. Able students should not only have experienced some application of linguistics but should also know something about the history of the English language.
4. Teachers may use college-level books if the students are doing college-level work.
5. Teachers must have both time for preparation and freedom in ordering books. There should be special library facilities, teacher aids or readers, taped lessons, and realistic class sizes.
6. Whatever one does in an Advanced Placement class one must do well—thoroughly and analytically. Avoid what is beyond the experiential ability of the seventeen year old.

Chairman: Floyd Rinker, CEEB Commission on English
Recorder: Sally Ann Peres, South High School, Denver
Consultants: Curtis Page, Drake University
Albert M. Serling, Educational Testing Service

22. ADMINISTERING THE FRESHMAN PROGRAM: COLLEGES

Over 30 members participated in Workshop 22. Prior to the discussion, the chairman distributed an outline of areas and problems in the administration of the freshman program. The outline served as a basis for the discussion, with three major emphases: (1) preparing a Freshman English program: personnel and material; (2) executing the Freshman English program: staff and meetings; (3) evaluating the Freshman English program: methods and techniques.

Comments were made by several participants pertaining to their own experiences in organizing and working with the Freshman English program. It became obvious immediately that the size of the program varied considerably. Yet certain agreements were reached: (1) a chairman of the Freshman English program should be appointed to relieve the division chairman; (2) the freshman composition chairman's teaching load should be reduced for him to administer the program in a competent manner; (3) a committee should be appointed by the chairman to work on textbook selection.

Some members declared that there was no unanimity in the objectives for freshman composition. Others, however, thought that English instructors should teach students to write good clear prose; that in itself was an objective. Effective communication, whether oral or written, is a major objective. The question of abolishing Freshman English arose. The consensus was that we should not do away with Freshman English. While most English teachers are prepared to teach literature rather than composition, it was generally agreed that Freshman English should not be abolished.

A final problem was the question of whether or not the research paper should be written in Freshman English courses. Opinions were varied. It was stated that the English department had an obligation to teach research papers in freshman composition because it is a service department in our colleges. The responsibility lies with the English department to teach the research paper, and it is up to the English teachers to fulfill that responsibility.

Chairman: Marion F. Coulson, Fort Hays Kansas State College
Co-Chairman: Sister Philip Mary, B.V.M., Clarke College
Recorder: Harry H. Hoffman, Kearney State College
Co-Recorder: Sister Edwin Mary, S. L., Loretto Heights College
Consultant: Richard E. Hughes, Boston College

23. ADMINISTERING THE FRESHMAN PROGRAM: UNIVERSITIES

Hubert English focused the workshop topic on the specific question "How can the director communicate the aims of the freshman course to his staff?" He suggested three methods: class visits, inspection of theme files, and sample paper grading sessions. He then explained and recommended a group grading practice session used at the U. of Michigan similar in some respects to that used by the CEEB essay readers.

Robert Bashore explained how some administration problems at Bowling Green were handled by establishing a paid position —Chairman of the Junior Staff—elected each year by the teaching assistants and fellows from among their own number. The responsibilities of the position included class visit scheduling and being a voting member of the composition committee.

John Nichol of Southern California discussed the practice of not putting grades on themes, thereby forcing the instructors to explain their evaluations in meaningful written comments on both strengths and weaknesses and forcing the student to really study the comments and marginal markings to understand the evaluation. Instructors should keep grades in grade books to discuss with students in conferences. He also pointed out the value of having instructors write papers on their own assigned topics, from time to time.

Workshop members then discussed other methods of communicating the aims of the course: senior faculty presentation of typical or controversial class situations in staff meeting; a syllabus sent out to all teaching assistants in the summer; a series of orientation meetings for the staff before classes begin; a required course in the teaching of composition before or during the first semester of teaching (one graduate student present said such a course during the first semester of teaching would be more meaningful); a common final exam or a theme on a common book. All these methods have dangers in that a staff will rightfully object to too much conformity, but these dangers must be measured against the department's responsibility in the guidance of new teachers and in providing quality and fair instruction for its students.

Chairman: Hubert M. English, Jr., University of Michigan
Co-Chairman: Robert Bashore, Jr., Bowling Green State University
Recorder: John W. Nichol, University of Southern California

Co-Recorder: Delbert E. Wylder, Utah State University
Consultant: James R. Hodges, University of Florida

24. LINGUISTICS AND THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION

Priscilla Tyler contended that it is the college composition teacher's task to correlate what writers do with the language and what grammarians find in it. She distributed copies of a syllabus for her course, "Writers and Language," as an example of what an upper-division course might do in this direction. She remarked on the necessity of exploring and teaching the relationships between syntactic patterns and punctuation, some of which she illustrated by manipulation of a display of blocks representing fillers for sentence-level syntactic slots.

Two of the panelists of the previous evening's program on this topic, Garland Cannon and Morris Finder, expanded their remarks on punctuation. Cannon defended the prefatory essay on punctuation in Merriam-Webster 3d as an adequate generalization from a significant corpus and as a pedagogically workable document. He commented on some important differences between Summey, *American Punctuation* (1949), and this essay. Finder provided a handout documenting a lack of correlation between terminal contours in spoken renditions of a corpus and written punctuation in the graphic version of the same corpus.

G. Thomas Fairclough spoke about the use of linguistic descriptions of sentence and paragraph patterns in the teaching of Freshman English. Such descriptions can be used for two purposes. One is to help students whose writing of sentences needs remediation; a few available textbooks for pattern practice were recommended as useful here. The other, and more interesting, is to expand the expressive competence of average writers; for this purpose an article by Viola Waterhouse, "Independent and Dependent Sentences" (*International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1962), has to date been extraordinarily stimulating in its effect upon several junior and senior high school programs and in upper division college courses. It needs a good try in Freshman English.

Rudolph Troike made extensive comments on the previous evening's panel paper by Louis Schaedler. He reminded the audience that numerous linguistic attitudes whose currency Schaedler had attributed to Charles C. Fries alone had been held by such 19th century scholars as Henry Sweet and W. D. Whitney. Troike recommended H. A. Gleason's new *Linguistics and English Grammar* to those desiring an understanding of the development of 20th century linguistic theory. Troike said linguists' conception of the relation of writing to speech is less simplistic than it was ten years ago and than Schaedler thinks it is now: speech and writing are both "modes of realization of language," with speech the primary mode. He concluded by saying that, for pedagogical purposes, a pluralist description of English, rather than a sectarian or single-model one, is necessary in our present state of grammatical knowledge and perhaps always will be.

Chairman: Priscilla Tyler, University of Illinois
Co-Chairman: Rudolph Troike, University of Texas
Recorder: G. Thomas Fairclough, Midwestern University
Co-Recorder: C. J. Raeth, Miami University, Ohio
Consultants: Garland Cannon, Queens College, City University of New York
Morris Finder, Western Washington State College
Louis C. Schaedler, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

25. DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT ON THE NCTE-MLA-NASDTEC STUDY OF ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

This workshop session was devoted to detailed reports by the three sub-committees of W29 on their revisions of the wording of the English Teacher Preparation Study. Subsequent discussion at the meeting was directed mainly to specific points of terminology and definition.

Chairman: William Card, Illinois Teachers College
Recorder: Gene Hardy, University of Nebraska

26. MAINTAINING PROFICIENCY IN WRITING AFTER THE FRESHMAN COURSE

Discussion began with some questions

about the effectiveness of proficiency examinations. One objection to these examinations is that they do not teach students to write; they merely keep them from graduating. At the least, however, such examinations given at the beginning of the senior year do stimulate students to review for the test.

Several methods intended to prevent student writing from rapidly deteriorating were discussed. Participants reporting programs requiring the cooperation of other faculty members said they had found most such plans unsatisfactory, largely because instructors in other divisions failed to cooperate. One university, where all instructors are encouraged to accompany their final grades with English deficiency notices—deficiencies that must be removed by taking a one-quarter remedial course before graduation—reported that out of a student body of about 9000, not more than 20 to 40 students a semester received notices. At another university, where all faculty were given gummed stickers and urged to attach them to any unacceptably written papers, only about 10 students out of 23,000 received stickers. It was suggested that one reason the faculty do not cooperate in such programs is that many of them distrust their own ability to judge good writing. Everyone can mark spelling, but many faculty members actually like gobbledygook or at least jargon, even though real gobbledygook often betrays a failure to understand the subject matter rather than merely a failure to write well. Further, it was suggested that some poor writing should be attributed to poor assignments. Often the trouble is that an essay question has been made so general that it cannot result in an organized, intelligible answer.

In contrast to these pessimistic reports, one participant explained an all-campus program which has worked successfully at his university for eight years. There every faculty member turns in an English grade (S for "satisfactory," U for "unsatisfactory," or N for "no chance to observe") with each final grade. Students receiving U's are sent to a proficiency laboratory where they are required to remain until they can write an essay satisfactory to two English teachers. Each year about 10% of the student body are remanded to this program, 5% more than once. The major advantage is that the plan convinces students that English teachers are not the only people who care about decent writing.

Other schools reported moderate success with variations of these plans: urging all instructors to insist that poorly written papers be rewritten; asking all instructors to correct for English proficiency as well as content; or forming collegewide committees on student writing, committees which at least serve to remind other departments that clear and acceptable writing is not solely the province of the English department.

Another program, depending only slightly on campus-wide cooperation, arose in a School of Business Administration as a result of community complaints that graduates could not write acceptably. At this university, students are given English instruction during both of their first two years. Further, each professor in the school gives one essay test and one paper each year. These papers are sent to the English proficiency department where, with the help of student assistants, each paper is graded and filed. Students who write unsatisfactorily are given help, often in personal conferences. Both students and faculty are said to be enthusiastic about the program.

The only plan which, once it has been adopted, requires no cooperation from faculty outside the English department involves extending the required freshman writing course over two, three, or even four years. This system, which is being tried in 15 or 20 schools throughout the country, none of which were represented in the workshop, seems to have several advantages: the students are more mature; the worst students have disappeared by the end of the sophomore year; the blame for failing students out of school does not fall entirely on the English department; the program requires a smaller staff and is thus less expensive; and because the students are better, the texts can be more difficult and the course more demanding. The main value of such a program, however, lies not in saving money or staff sanity but in its tendency really to maintain proficiency as long as the students remain in school. Suggested disadvantages are two:

first, colleges may have an obligation to teach all new students, even those who become dropouts, as much as they can learn about acceptable writing; and second, the writing improvement that results from a full first year course may be the means of salvaging some students who otherwise would flunk out. Another similar suggestion involved required advanced writing courses, perhaps paralleling those often given in technical writing, courses in which a student majoring in social science, for instance, might be better motivated to improve his writing because his course was called "Writing in the Social Sciences."

Chairman: James B. Stronks, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Co-Chairman: Wm. O. S. Sutherland, Jr., University of Texas
Recorder: Elisabeth McPherson, Clark College, Vancouver, Washington
Co-Recorder: Deatt Hudson, Colorado Women's College
Consultants: Robert Bain, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Phillips G. Davies, Iowa State University
Helen I. White, Minot State College

28. TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

In its three discussions, this small but loquacious group touched upon most of the problems involved in teaching writing to foreign students: the relations between reading and composition, the choice of topics (often the key to motivation), the use of dictionaries (bilingual or monolingual), the value of conferences, the system of marking and grading, and allied matters. But most of what was said revolved about one central problem: the question of how the material taught in a course can be organized in some meaningful sequence, and how this sequence is relevant to composition and its evaluation.

There was general agreement that all the strands in a composition—from the most elementary grammatical construction to the most subtle point of style—ought to be locatable on a scale from most important to least important, and that grading should take account of the location of errors on this scale; furthermore, the scale should largely reflect the order in which grammatical, lexical and stylistic points are presented in the course itself, so that the degree or seriousness of a given error will be determined mostly by whether the student has or has not studied the point at issue.

What is desirable is to control the grammar, lexicon and style of a student's theme, so that in writing he will practice the materials that are being dealt with at the moment in the course itself. But the problem is how to achieve this controlled relevance, and how to deal with intrusive matters that are bound to creep in despite controls. It seems wise to have students rewrite their compositions (following a conference, or following a private marking of the theme with symbols keyed to the text) but, though the teacher does not want to waste time on points not yet taught, he still cannot allow errors on such points to slip by entirely without comment, for he dare not allow the student to rewrite them, thus practicing errors. At the same time, the teacher does not want to kill enthusiasm by marking too much. Thus there is all the more reason for controls.

When our group considered research needed in the field, it was agreed that the question of greatest importance was that concerning the best sequence for the presentation of materials in the daily lessons, for upon that sequence much else depends. Other research questions were proposed: what elements of style and rhetoric go into a good Spanish or Arabic theme, and how do such things differ from our preferences in English? Can we make contrastive studies of metaphorical systems and arrive at an orderly way to teach our system? Can we discover the ways in which our evaluation system tends to kill enthusiasm in persons from other cultures?

After these discussions, and somewhat sadly, the group agreed upon the following three resolutions:

1. That, given the small attendance at this workshop for several years under the aegis of CCCC, the group should meet hereafter only at NCTE meetings; the group thanks CCCC for its hospitality past and present.
2. That a TEFL be appointed to investigate needed research projects in our area, and that CCCC and NCTE

give thought to sponsoring such research.

3. That CCCC appoint a liaison person to maintain contact with ATESL and TESOL.

Chairman: Robert B. Kaplan, University of Southern California
Co-Chairman: Gladys F. Doty, University of Colorado
Recorder: Richard L. Gunter, Ohio State University
Co-Recorder: Ralph P. Barrett, Michigan State University
Consultants: Edward G. Fisher, Colorado School of Mines
Norman C. Stageberg, State College of Iowa
Robert Wachal, University of Iowa

INVITATIONAL WORKSHOP IN ADVANCED COMPOSITION

Schools being so varied, with a freshman course at one possibly as challenging as an advanced course at another, the workshop began with a functional definition: advanced composition is the course offered next after the freshman course, assuming competence in the basic skills taught in the first year at the school. This definition assumes that sophomores know more and want to do more with composition than they knew and did as freshmen. Several schools offer a sequence of courses to train both more sophisticated and more specialized practices, the common goal being a humane discipline in the language. Students needing remedial work should be assigned to a remedial class. Mr. Slack distinguished the kinds of advanced composition courses according to how directly they arise from the basic skills of the freshman course. Picture a box labeled "freshman course" with five boxes in a horizontal line under it, and the "advanced composition" box on a short straight line drawn from the freshman course. To the right of the "advanced" box are two more on longer, oblique lines: the first labeled "for future teachers" and the second (at the far right of the line of boxes) "literary forms." To the left of the "advanced" box are two more, also with longer, oblique lines to the freshman course: "business and professional" and "scientific and technical."

This diagram shows that the usual advanced composition course differs from the first year in degree, not kind, and other courses differ as they use fewer common expository patterns and assume special forms. Mr. Folsom proposed a list of common elements which all agreed were the particular content of the middle box and at least the needed frame for work found in any other box right or left along the line: the rhetoric implicit in syntactic structures, in the levels of assertion and support in the paragraph, and in the perspectives of the whole essay; the emotive and rational appeal of diction, and of styles adapted to special readers or types of prose (especially description, explanation, and argument); and greater ethical and logical control in uses of evidence. Beyond these concerns, Mr. Folsom suggested another course to study the assumptive patterns into which writers commonly arrange their material. All agreed that distinctions between creative and expository writing are illusory, and obscure the affective techniques of rhythm and unity common to all prose discourse.

Mr. Christensen placed the "future teachers" box between the "advanced" and "literary" ones, arguing that just another course in expository writing could not prepare teachers for the many kinds of problems they have to cope with. The teacher needs training in both the structure and history of the language, in both discursive and imaginative writing (including both theory and practice), and in usage, semantics, and logic. There is not time for courses in all these areas, but if the advanced composition course can build on a course in the structure of the language, it can be designed to open up the other areas, show how they are interrelated and can be integrated, and awaken the scholarly impetus that keeps the teacher going on his own. The course must launch the teacher not only as a writer but as critic and scholar.

Similarly, Miss Bromage spoke of the high literacy required in the business report and prospectus, the broad relevance demanded in adapting scientific detail to a lay audience. The rigorous advanced composition course deserves academic status, and the ideal teacher would have a graduate degree in English, would have studied the history and structure of English, rhetoric, semantics, and logic, and would be a good writer himself (though not necessarily published); the teacher prepared only in literature and criticism probably needs to know more before teaching composition.

Miss Neville's course may show some useful practices for the small college. For the first half-semester, she presents basic knowledge in rhetoric and language, then divides the class into small tutorials for students with special interests and needs. Other points: Mr. Howes reminded that students' themes are better for a text than a book of theory; Mr. Lloyd-Jones reminded that the best way to decide class-size is the number of themes that can be read well, either alone or with the help of graders, though the average size is "smaller than the freshman section"—15-25; graduate assistants can be useful when trained and supervised; theme assignments ought to be cumulative, each theme being a version of all work done in the course to date; revision is a valuable practice; a grade is far less important than a thoughtfully written comment (few give more than two or three grades a semester); research papers have little place in advanced composition with its interest in stylistic patterns; the assigned length of themes or number of words a semester is less vital than controlled practice of writing patterns, to perform in a type of prose or meet an audience-situation.

Because their topic is broad and problematical, the members of the workshop recommend that CCCC continue to hold discussions that will go beyond the rather general findings of this year's group.

Chairman: Richard Lloyd-Jones, University of Iowa
Co-Chairmen: Donald W. Emery, University of Washington
William Gillis, Bradley University
Recorder: John Lindberg, State College of Iowa
Co-Recorders: John Folsom, Boston University
Alan B. Howes, University of Michigan
Robert C. Slack, Carnegie Institute of Technology
Consultants: Mary Bromage, University of Michigan
Francis Christensen, University of Southern California
Glenn Leggett, Grinnell College
Fred MacIntosh, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
John McKiernan, College of St. Thomas
Margaret Neville, DePaul University
Darwin Turner, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College
Gordon D. Wilson, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

COPYRIGHT, 1966, BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."